

SOUTHERN SPEECH BULLETIN

VOLUME 2

1936-1937

Printed in U. S. A.

THE SOUTHERN SPEECH BULLETIN

Published
by
THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH

VOLUME II

OCTOBER, 1936

NUMBER 1

CONTENTS

COMMON ERRORS IN OUR DAILY SPEECH.....	1
<i>By C. M. Wise</i>	
SPEECH EDUCATION IN AN INTEGRATED CURRICULUM.....	9
<i>By James H. McBurney</i>	
CROSS YOUR T'S AND DOT YOUR I'S.....	14
<i>By Jeanne Allen Perkins</i>	
BEAUTY IN BRICKS WITHOUT STRAW.....	17
<i>By James Watt Raine</i>	
EXERCISES FOR SPEECH IMPROVEMENT.....	21
<i>By Clio Allen</i>	
REFLECTIONS OF A HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE COACH.....	26
<i>By Lottie K. McCall</i>	
THE 1937 ALL-SOUTH SPEECH TOURNAMENT.....	28
<i>By Orville C. Miller</i>	
THE FUNDAMENTAL COURSE	32
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION	34
EDITORIALS	35
<i>The Second Year</i>	
<i>Unity in Diversity</i>	
BOOK REVIEWS	37
<i>By Leroy Lewis</i>	
NEWS AND NOTES.....	40
<i>By Louise Sawyer</i>	

THE SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH

OFFICERS

President.....	Giles W. Gray
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, La.	
First Vice-President.....	Miss Sarah Lowrey
Baylor University, Waco, Texas	
Second Vice-President.....	Miss Laveta Epperson
Central High School, Chattanooga, Tenn.	
Third Vice-President.....	Orville C. Miller
Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.	
Fourth Vice-President.....	Irving C. Stover
Stetson University, DeLand, Fla.	
Executive Secretary.....	A. A. Hopkins
University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.	

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

The Executive Council is composed of the Officers of the Association and the Presidents of the various Southern State Speech Associations.

THE SOUTHERN SPEECH BULLETIN

Miss Rose B. Johnson.....	Editor
Woodlawn High School, Birmingham, Ala.	
Orville C. Miller.....	Assistant Editor
Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.	
Harley Smith.....	Assistant Editor
L. S. U., Baton Rouge, La.	
Leroy Lewis.....	Book Reviews
Duke University, Durham, N. C.	
Miss Louise Sawyer.....	News and Notes
Georgia State Woman's College, Valdosta, Ga.	
A. A. Hopkins.....	Business Manager
University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.	

The Southern Speech Bulletin is published in the months of October and March by Weatherford Printing Company, Tuscaloosa, Alabama for the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech.

Subscriptions, including membership in the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech, \$1.50 per year. Single copies 50c.

THE SOUTHERN SPEECH BULLETIN

VOLUME II

OCTOBER, 1936

NUMBER 1

COMMON ERRORS IN OUR DAILY SPEECH¹

C. M. WISE

Louisiana State University

Speech is beyond doubt the greatest fundamental intellectual achievement of mankind. It is little surprising, therefore, that words are perennially fascinating to practically every person. People are always experimenting with them, juggling, discovering. A student who stumbles upon the fact that *triumvirate* is not related to *triumph*, but to *tres viri*, must tell everyone. Another finds *protest* in the word *protestant* and never thereafter calls it *prodestant*. Someone finds a cognate of *mimic* in *pantomime*, and abandons the faulty *pantomine*.

People pun—in vaudeville, radio and bantering chatter. They comment that punning is low humor (a cliché much in need of qualification), and immediately indulge in that form to the limit of ingenuity. The professor's Austin car is too *ostentatious*, says one—and all in hearing laugh eagerly.

The layman's interest in speech centers on pronunciation. That is a fortunate—more, a precious, thing. The teacher of speech can capitalize effectively on this interest.

Just now, with interest in curricular speech spreading happily into every progressive college and high school, the time is ripe for a definite and organized attack on the problem of the common errors in our daily speech. Most students need to improve their pronunciation; *sotto voce*, some teachers do too. Here, then, is a tentative list of the errors common to our area. It will need revision and addition as we study the situation more closely, but meantime it is proving useful as a leaping point for investigation and as a basis for pronunciation improvement.

The Confusion of [ɑ] and [ɔ]

In accented syllables, the orthographic combination *ar* plus a consonant or final, if not preceded by a [w] sound, is very frequently given the erroneous sound [ɔ]. As a result, *yard* [ja:d] is pronounced *yawd* [jɔ:d], *park* [pa:k] is pronounced *pawk* [pɔ:k], etc. This practice tends to produce homonyms such as *Carl*, *call*; *card*, *cawed*; *hearty*,

¹ This article contains considerable material from an article by the same writer in the 1936 *Proceedings* of the American Speech Correction Association (distributed by College Typing Co., 720 State St., Madison, Wis.). This material is used by permission.

haughty; are, awe; etc. The confusion of these homonyms is often amusing. A certain romantically inclined young Negro boy in Baton Rouge once painted "Sea-Hark" across the cowl of his Ford delivery truck and went about with it for many months, apparently quite satisfied with his spelling of *Sea-Hawk*. A fruit store owner likewise advertised on his show window "Sugar Cane, Three Starks (stalks) 5 cents."

[ɔ] to [ɔɔ]

The homonyms resulting from raising [ɑ] to [ɔ], as indicated above, are sometimes forestalled by the diphthongization of [ɔ] to [ɔɔ]. Thus, some speakers who pronounce *hark* [hɑ:k] as *hawk* [hɔ:k], appear to avoid a homonymous situation by pronouncing *hawk* [hɔk] as *haw-oak* [hɔok]. *Talk* [tɔk] with such speakers becomes *taw-oak* [tɔok]; *walk* [wɔk], *waw-oak* [wɔok]; etc.

[ɔ] to [ou]

Related to the preceding paragraph, but at the same time seemingly separated from it by the completeness of the shift, is the raising of [ɔ] to the diphthong [ou] in a very limited number of words where the vowel is followed by *n*. The commonest of these words are *want* [wɔnt], *on* [ɔn], *upon* [əpɔn], and *gone* [gɔn]. These are quite clearly and definitely pronounced *won't* [wɔunt], *own* [oun], *a pone* [ə poun], and *goan* [goun]. (Those who pronounce *on* as *ahn* [ɑn] are not liable to this error.)

[ɛ] to [ɪ]

[ɛ] before a nasal, either *m* [m], *n* [n], or *ng* [ŋ], is most insistently raised to the next lax vowel above it, [ɪ], so that *pen* [pɛn] becomes *pin* [pɪn]; *attempt* [ətɛmpt], *attimpt* [ətɪmpt]; *gentle* [dʒɛntəl], *gintle* [dʒɪntəl]; *strength* [strɛŋkθ], *stringth* [strɪŋkθ]; etc. This error, of course, creates many puzzling homonyms. For example: *cents, since; meant, mint; gem, Jim; send, sinned; etc.*

The basic form of this error as just recorded has a number of related variants clustering around it. Sometimes it appears that a given speaker has only one vowel for both [ɪ] and [ɛ]. This vowel is probably a raised [ɛ] or a lowered [ɪ], which the speaker uses indiscriminately for both phonemes. With the psychological perversity well known in such cases, a hearer not addicted to the error will feel that the speaker is continually reversing the position of [ɪ] and [ɛ]: that is, when the speaker uses his medial sound in *men* [mɛn], the word sounds to the hearer like *min* [mɪn]; but if he uses it in *Minnie* [mɪni], the word sounds perversely like *many* [meni].

Again, some speakers who have discovered themselves to be using [ɪ] erroneously for [ɛ] grow wary of the [ɪ] sound and tend to sub-

stitute [ɛ] in places where [ɪ] should legitimately be used. This form of hyper-urbanism produces *enterest* [ɛntərəst] where *interest* [ɪntərəst] is intended, *semple* [sempɫ] for *simple* [sɪmpɫ]; etc.

Yet again, the two words *length* and *strength* present paradoxical problems. If they are pronounced with the *ng* [ŋ], they are likely to be *lingth* [lɪŋkθ] and *stringth* [strɪŋkθ], as above; but with hundreds of people, the *ng* [ŋ] is never pronounced: *n* [n] is substituted, and the words are *lenth* [lenθ] and *strenth* [strenθ]. Just why the [ɛ] does not become [ɪ] and produce *linth* [lɪnθ] and *strinth* [strɪnθ] is, so far as I know, unexplained.

Among the thousands of French speakers in Louisiana [ɛ] is often lowered to approximately the position of the French [ɛ]. When these French-speaking people pronounce the English *ten* [ten], it sounds much like *tan* [tæn].

The Raising of [ɛ] to [eɪ]

When not followed by a nasal, [ɛ] sometimes, especially before a voiced plosive, tends to suffer a mutation in the direction of the next tense vowel above. *Head* [hɛd] becomes *haid* [heɪd], *edge* [ɛdʒ] becomes *age* [eɪdʒ], *leg* [lɛɡ] becomes *laig* [leɪɡ], *egg* [ɛɡ] becomes *aig* [eɪɡ], etc. An occasional reversing of this error sometimes occurs when *make* [meɪk] is pronounced as *meck* [mek], *take* [teɪk] as *teck* [tek], *snake* [sneɪk] as *sneck* [snek], *naked* [neɪkɪd] as *nekkid* [nekɪd], etc.

The Raised [æ]

The vowel [æ] is with great frequency pronounced with the tongue very high in the mouth, so that a pinched or gagging effect results. This is very difficult to represent by symbols. Merely a raising sign does not imply the full effect of the vowel in the faulty rendition of *path* [pæ⁺θ], *wrath* [ræ⁺θ], etc.

Perhaps because of the fact that with the tongue thus raised the oral passage is almost blocked, this raised [æ] tends with great frequency to be nasalized. [kæ̃⁺n], [mæ̃⁺n], etc., for *can* [kæn], *man* [mæn] result. This nasalization is not limited to words spelled with vowel plus nasal; [ðæ̃⁺t], [træ̃⁺p] for *that* and *trap*, etc., are not unknown. In the case of *man* [mæn], the raising is sometimes so great as to produce an effect of the diphthong [eɪ], so that the word sounds almost like *main* [mein]. In the instance of *can't* [kænt], the mutation to *cain't* [keɪnt] is entirely complete with many, many speakers.

Because [k] and [g] in the South are often spoken as far front as possible in a given context, there tends, almost inevitably, to develop between these consonants and *ä* [æ] a more or less prominent *y* [j].

Cat [kæt] thereupon sounds very much like *k'yat* [kjæt], *gas* [gæs] sounds like *gyas* [gjæs], etc.

[aʊ] to [æʊ], [æ̃ʊ], [jæʊ] and [jæ̃ʊ]

Closely related to the raising of [æ] is the raising of the [a] in the diphthong [aʊ]. The first element of the diphthong becomes a very high [æ], so that *out* [aʊt] is *aout* [æ⁺ʊt] and *house* [haus], *haouse* [hæ⁺ʊs]. In many instances, but especially before nasals, the diphthong itself is strongly nasalized as in *daown* [dæ̃ʊn], *braown* [bræ̃ʊn], for *down* [daʊn], *brown* [braʊn]. Through the influence of the front [k] and [g], as mentioned above, a y [j] develops between the diphthong and the preceding [k] or [g], so that *cow* [kaʊ] is *kyaow* [kjæʊ], *gown* [gaʊn] in *gyaown* [gjæʊn], etc.

The Undiphthongization of *i* [aɪ]

The diphthong *i* [aɪ] very frequently loses its second element. Experimentation is now going on to discover the conditions under which this happens. Some think it is most likely to happen when the *i* [aɪ] sound is final or followed by a voiced consonant, and least likely to happen when the *i* [aɪ] sound is followed by a voiceless consonant. The remaining element of the diphthong is probably most frequently pronounced with the "compromise *a*" [a], but is also in many cases pronounced *ah* [ɑ]. Accordingly, the pronoun *I* [aɪ] may become [a] or *ah* [ɑ]; *bride* [braɪd], [brad] or *brahd* [brɑd]; *Friday* [fraɪdɪ], [fradɪ] or *Frahday* [frɑdɪ], etc. But *bright* is likely to remain [braɪt].

It seems a long story to follow the evolution from the Old English and Middle English *i* [i] to the adoption of a preceding [a] or [ɑ] to produce the diphthong [aɪ] or [ɑɪ], and on to the losing of all semblance of the original [i] element and the retention only of the acquired [a] or [ɑ]. One wonders what the next change will be. If this [ɑ] follows the history of other southern [ɑ]'s before *r*, one might suppose that the next step would be a shift of the pronunciation of *ire* [aɪə] to *awe* [ɔ:], *fire* [faɪə] to *faw* [fɔ:], *mire* [maɪə] to *maw* [mɔ:], etc.

[ɜ:] to [ɜɪ]

ear, *er*, *ir*, *or*, *ur* in accented syllables before consonants often become [ɜɪ], producing *huh-id* [hɜɪd] for *heard* [hɜ:d], *tuh-im* [tɜɪm] for *term* [tɜ:m], *buh-id* [bɜɪd] for *bird* [bɜ:d], *wuh-ick* [wɜɪk] for *work* [wɜ:k], *uh-in* [ɜɪn] for *urn* [ɜ:n], etc. In a few instances in urban speech, the shift in words of this class is more radical, even, than just indicated, and *burn* [bɜ:n] will be heard as *boin* [bɔɪn], *word* [wɜ:d] as *woid* [wɔɪd], quite as in the most exaggerated of Brooklyn and Bowery speech. Like their eastern fellows, southern urban dwellers

who make this error will often make the complementary error of pronouncing *spoil* [spɔɪl] as *spɛrl* [spɛɪl], *point* [pɔɪnt] as *pɛrnt* [pɛɪnt], etc.

Intrusive y [j]

The intrusion of y [j] between [k] and [g] and following vowels is not limited to front consonants like [æ], as in a preceding paragraph. *Car* [kɑ:] and *garden* [gɑdən] may easily become *kyar* [kjɑ:] and *gyarden* [gjɑ:dən], despite the back vowel, as is well known in Virginia.

u after [d], [t], [m]

u after [d], [t], and [n] is quite commendably *yu* [ju] in the South, but the habit of pronouncing orthographic u as *yu* [ju] sometimes erroneously carries over into words with oo instead of u, like *too* [tu], *do* [du], *noon* [nun], and thus produces *tew* [tju], *dew* [dju], and *nyoon* [nju]. Probably the change is seldom so radical as just indicated. The mispronunciation is often better represented as [tiu], [diu], and [niu].

Final o [ɔ]

Final [ɔ] is frequently unstressed to [ə]. For example, *Nigra* [nɪgrə] for *Negro* [nɪgru], *tomorra* [təmarə] for *tomorrow* [təmaro], *potata* [pətətə] for *potato* [pəteto], *tomata* [təmeɪtə] for *tomato* [təmeɪto], *winda* [wɪndə] for *window* [wɪndo], etc.

The Omission of [l]

l is very commonly omitted from all combinations of the pronoun *self* [self], as well as from *help* [help], *twelve* [twelv], *college* [kəlɪdʒ], *William* [wɪljəm], etc., producing *se'f* [sef], *he'p* [hep], *twe've* [twev], *kah-idge* [kɑ-ɪdʒ], *Wi'yam* [wi:jəm], etc. As an amusing result of the phonetic relation of dark l to o, speakers often believe themselves to pronounce the l in *walk* [wɔk], *talk* [tɔk], etc. What they are really saying is *waw-oak* [wɔok], *taw-oak* [tɔok], as indicated in a previous paragraph.

Omissions from Final Consonant-Clusters

In the combinations *ts*, *sts*, *ks*, and *sk*s, *nd*, *nds*, *ld*, *lds*, some consonants are almost sure to be omitted. *Next* [nekst] becomes *nex'* [neks]; *best* [best] becomes *bes'* [bes]; *ghosts* [gousts], *ghos'* [gou:s] or *ghost* [goust]; *insists* [ɪnsɪsts], *insis'* [ɪnsɪs:] or *insist* [ɪnsɪst]; *hand* [hænd], *han'* [hæn]; *lands* [lænds], *lan's* [lænz]; *field* [fild], *fiel'* [fi:l]; *shields* [ʃildz], *shiel's* [ʃilz]; *asks* [æskz], *ask* [æsk]; *asked* [æskt], *ask* [æsk] or *ast* [æst].

Elision of Medial Sounds

Medial sounds, even whole syllables, tend to frequent curtailment or omission. *Reco'nize* [rɛkənaɪz] is perhaps the commonest example as

an erroneous pronunciation of *recognize* [rəkəgnəɪz]; but *pronunciation* [prənʌnsɪʃən] becomes *pronunc'ation* [prənʌnsɪʃən]; *period* [pɪrɪəd] becomes *per'od* [pɪrəd], *seriously* [sɪrɪəsli] becomes *ser'ously* [sɪrəsli]; etc.

Dropping of [h]

[h] or the [ç] is often dropped from words beginning with orthographic *hu* in urban pronunciations. *Huge* [hjudʒ] becomes *yuge* [judʒ]; *human* [hjumən] becomes *yuman* [jumən]; etc.

th [θ] to [t], and *th* [ð] to [d]

It is common in the French part of Louisiana for *th* [θ] as in *thin* and *th* [ð] as in *this* to become [t] and [d]. Unfortunately, this pronunciation is not limited to the English of the French-speaking people, but is common with many others; *this* [ðɪs], *that* [ðæt], *these* [ðɪz], *those* [ðouz], *they* [ðeɪ], *them* [ðəm], *the* [ðə], *other* [ʌðə] are all too frequently *dis* [dɪs], *dat* [dæt], *dese* [dɪz], *dose* [douz], *deɪ* [deɪ], *dem* [dɛm], *de* [də], *udder* [ʌdə].

With may be pronounced *wid* [wɪd] or *wit* [wɪt]. *Th*'s in nearly all other words are likely to be pronounced [θ] or [ð], quite in the correct manner. The difficulty is with the frequently used pronouns, adjectives, articles, and conjunctions.

n [n] for *ng* [ŋ]

n [n] is substituted for *ng* [ŋ] probably more frequently in the South than in other parts of the English speaking world; thus *mo'nin'* [mɔ:nɪn] or [mɔ:nɪn] for *morning* [mɔ:nɪŋ], *comin* [kɑ:mɪn] for *coming* [kɑ:mɪŋ], etc., are quite common. Speakers often make a pseudo-correction by saying *comeen* [kɑ:mɪn], etc., instead of the correct *coming* [kɑ:mɪŋ], etc.

Omission of linking [r]

Linking [r] is often omitted medially and practically always finally except by very careful speakers. *Marry* [mæɪrɪ] and *carry* [kæɪrɪ] become *ma'y* [mæɪ] and *ca'y* [kæɪ]. *Her own* [hər ɔʊn] becomes *he'own* [həʔɔʊn] or [həʊn]; *our own* [aʊr ɔʊn] becomes *ou' own* [aʊʔɔʊn] or *ou' woun* [aʊwɔʊn]. In urban speech the excrescent linking [r] appears as in the *idear of it* [aɪdɪər ʌ vɪt] for *idea of it* [aɪdɪəʔɔʊl ɪt], and *Bogalusar and Franklin* [boʊgəlusər ən fræŋklɪn] for *Bogalusas and Franklin* [boʊgəlusə ənd fræŋklɪn].

Omission of Final [r]

Another *r* difficulty is in instances, usually following diphthongs, where *r* should in standard southern speech be pronounced [ə]. This sound is often omitted. Thus *four* [foʊ] becomes *fo'* [fo], *door* [doʊ]

becomes *do'* [do], *more* [moə] becomes *mo'* [mo], etc., while *our* [auə] pronounced *ou'* [au] is not unknown, and *fire* [faɪə] pronounced *fah* [fa:] can be heard.

Retracted Accent

Two-syllable words properly accented on the second syllable are almost always accented on the first syllable. *Po'lice* ['poulis], for *po-lice'* [pə'lis], *Mon'roe* ['manrou] for *Monroe'* [mən'rou], *e'vent* ['ivent] for *event'* [ɪ'vent], *puck'on* ['pakən] or *pee'can* ['pikan] for *pecan'* [pi'kan], etc., are examples. Three-syllable words sometimes suffer this distortion. *I'dea* ['aɪdɪə] for *ide'a* [aɪ'diə], *af'ternoon* ['æftənun] for *afternoon'* [æftə'nun], *in'surance* ['ɪnsʊərənts] for *in-sur'ance* [ɪn'ʃurənts], etc., are heard. As with a good many other errors, a compensating hyper-urbanism may appear as *locate'* [lo'keit], for *lo'cate* ['louket].

Nasality

Nasality is extremely common, especially on *ă* [æ] and *ow* [au] followed by *m* [m], *n* [n], and *ng* [ŋ]. Thus *hand* [hænd] becomes [hænd̃], *down* [daʊn] becomes *daown* [dæʊñ], etc. (See discussion of the drawl, following, for the diphthongizing which frequently combines with this error.

High Pitch

Voices too high-pitched, i.e., higher than the optimum pitch for the given individuals, are very, very common, especially among girls and women.

Lax Enunciation

Languid articulation and enunciation, characterized by lip-laziness, tongue-laziness, and velum-laziness, may be considered the explanation of a great many of the errors of speech with which we have to deal.

The Drawl

The preceding discussion will be seen to have close relation to a similar discussion by the same writer elsewhere.² I quote from this

"The southern drawl deserves separate consideration. There is a certain wrongness about listing it as one of the errors of speech, for in moderation it is an engaging characteristic. Moreover, not all southerners use it. But in excess it becomes an error by reason of its conspicuousness. This drawl is not merely slowness, as is often supposed;

² Giles Wilkeson Gray, and Claude Merton Wise, *Bases of Speech* (Harper and Brothers, 1934), Chap. IV.
work on the subject of the southern drawl.

it is a diphthongization, triphthongization, and double diphthongization of vowels, *resulting* from slowness. English has few pure vowels at best: *a* = [ɛɪ]; *i* = [aɪ]; *o* = [oʊ]; and even *e* is often [ɪɪ]. An off-glide with any vowel is more nearly the rule than the exception. The southern drawl continues the diphthongizing and triphthongizing process until any stressed vowel is likely to become two, three, or four vowels. In the course of this attenuating, front vowels may develop a [j] medially, and back vowels a [w]. The possible results follow:

[æ] becomes [æjə, æɪjə], as in *bass* [bæjəs, bæɪjəs].

[ɛ] becomes [ɛjə, ɛɪjə], as in *yes* [jejəs, jeɪjəs]. The [ɛ] may even be raised and diphthongized to [eɪ], so that [jeɪjəs] results.

[ɪ] becomes [ɪjə], as in *bit* [bɪjət].

[ɔ] becomes [ɔwə], as in *cord* [kɔwəd].

[ʊ] becomes [ʊwə], as in *good* [gʊwəd].

[u] becomes [uwə], as in *cute* [kjuwət].

[ɜ:] being central, cannot develop [j] or [w], but becomes [ɜɪ], as in *burn* [bɜɪn]."

This summary does not attempt to classify all the errors of everyday speech—only the outstanding ones. Some I have not found a convenient way of classifying, as, for instance, typical mispronunciations usually indicating extreme provincialism or illiteracy, such as *toe* [tɒʊ] for *to* [tʊ], *wha(r)* [ʌɑ(r)], *tha(r)* [ðɑ(r)] for *where* [ʌɛə], *there* [ðɛə]; *foward* [faʊwəd] for *forward* [fɔ:wəd]; *jine* [dʒaɪn] and *pint* [paɪnt] for *join* [dʒɔɪn] and *point* [pɔɪnt]; *drap* [dræp] for *drop* [drɒp]; *gwine* [gwaɪn] for *going* [gouɪŋ]; *year* [jɪə(r)] for *ear* [ɪə] and *hear* [hɪə]; *borned* [bɔ:nd] for *born* [bɔ:n]; etc., etc.

NOTE: word-lists and other exercises for the correction of these errors may be found in the following-named books:

The Bases of Speech, by Giles Wilkeson Gray and Claude Merton Wise. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1934.

A Workbook in Southern Speech, by Claude Merton Wise and Clio Allen. Mimeographed edition, 1936. Address Miss Clio Allen, State Normal College, Natchitoches, Louisiana.

This article was set up by *The Ann Arbor Press* in order to get the phonetic symbols. The expense was paid by the author and editor.

EIGHTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

Nashville, Tennessee, April 20 - 24, 1937

SPEECH EDUCATION IN AN INTEGRATED CURRICULUM

BY JAMES H. MCBURNEY*
Northwestern University

I. A Note From History

Speech education has occupied the attention of substantial numbers of teachers and students since the very beginnings of education. The rhetorical schools of ancient Greece and Rome were schools of speech which every educated young man of the time was expected to attend. At their best they attempted to give a broad training in citizenship and public affairs which would prepare the student for an active, useful place in the society of which he was a part. The attempt was to develop men with high ideals, wide knowledge, and competence in thinking and speaking. The flower of education in the opinion of these early schoolmasters was the cultured, informed, articulate individual. Training in thinking and speaking occupied the center of their attention, and was in fact the integrating factor in the curriculum of their schools. Many times these ancient educators pointed out that ability in thinking and speaking (which they held to be closely related), more than anything else, marked the difference between man and beast. Their aim was "the good man skilled in speaking", the man who *knew* to be sure, but who was capable of making his thoughts effectively articulate in the assembly, the forum, the courts, and in the discussions of everyday life.

Thus it was that knowledge about people and affairs was brought into the curriculum in connection with varied experiences in speaking in which attention was given to the form and content of the speech in the same situation. Ethics and Politics especially, the two fields of knowledge which the ancients thought to be most essential for the speaker, were taught through the same activities which were designed to develop competence in speaking. Here was an integrated curriculum, and with speech activities operating as the integrating factor—three-hundred fifty years before Christ!

The modern speech educator can take many lessons from the history of the speech curriculum. Two of these will serve to introduce what I have to say about the place of speech in an integrated curriculum. We have in these rhetorical schools of ancient Greece and Rome

*Fellow of the Advanced School of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935-1936.

an instance in which speech was taught in immediate conjunction with those substantive fields of knowledge which were thought to contribute to the development of an educated man—in many cases, by the same teacher and in the same classroom. Such, for example, was the conception and practice of Isocrates, one of the most distinguished teachers of speech of the early Greek period. Discussions, debates, and speeches were heard and criticised both from the standpoint of rhetorical form and subject-matter content. Furthermore, the history of these schools appear to indicate that their strength lay in their attempt to develop the whole man through a broad cultural training emphasizing individual growth and competence. In the case of both the Greek and Roman schools the separation of form and content may be taken as a sign if not a cause of their decline. This can be seen, for example, in the decadence in the Roman rhetorical schools which was beginning to take place at the time of Quintilian. The declamation schools of this period, with their separation from real life and emphasis upon speech for display in terms of style and delivery, demonstrate the puerility to which speech training can be reduced under these circumstances.

There is a second point involved in this note from history—the classical rhetoricians and teachers of speech always conceived of rhetoric as comprehending a consideration of the thought processes involved in speaking, the selection and arrangement of ideas, the working up of the case, and matters relating to proof and evidence. This was studied as *inventio* or invention, in addition to style and delivery, and was considered by the better classical writers to be the most significant part of speech training. In any case, the history of rhetoric shows nothing more clearly than the decadence which speech education suffers whenever these matters which the ancients knew as invention become divorced from style and delivery. Aristotle complains of the failure of the early Greek sophists to give adequate attention to invention. The aridity of rhetoric during much of the middle ages may be traced to this separation. The nineteenth century elocution movement in England and America presents another instance of this same point.

What I am attempting to say here is that an examination of the history of speech education appears to indicate that there is real danger (1) in too great a separation between formal instruction in speech (including invention) and instruction in those matters about which any significant speech must of necessity take place, and (2) in any conception of speech training which tends to limit it to style, delivery, voice, and action exclusive of those considerations which enter into the

thought sequences involved in speech. I make this latter point in this connection because I wish to make it clear that I include all these considerations when I refer to speech and speech education.

II. Two Conceptions of the Curriculum

There are in general two fairly distinct conceptions of the curriculum today, one, commonly called the traditional or subject-matter curriculum, and the other the progressive, activity, or integrated curriculum. The organization of the first is in terms of areas of human knowledge such as history, English, and geography. Briefly, it consists in passing on to the student more or less compartmentalized areas of information on the theory of preparing the individual for adult life by equipping him with a knowledge of our cultural heritage.

The so-called integrated or activity curriculum is organized with respect to the guided interests of the student and consists in a program of directed activities with emphasis on the growth of the student in his capacity to think and act intelligently in problem situations. Any single activity may involve experiences which elicit information and help from a large number of the usual subject-matter fields. In other words, the curriculum becomes the experiences of the individual organized with respect to democratically planned and executed activities and conducted under the guidance of competent teachers. Knowledge of the cultural heritage is developed as it is requisitioned by the interests and needs of the learners working in problem situations.

III. Speech Education in the Curriculum

Speech in the traditional curriculum has gradually asserted itself as a separate subject worthy of departmental recognition. Such is its status now in many (if not most) colleges and universities and in not a few of the secondary schools. Let it be said here that speech has not achieved its place in the traditional curriculum without considerable effort on the part of teachers of speech in the last thirty years. And now when it appears that we are about to enjoy the fruits of this recognition, we are being told in some quarters that the days of separate departments are limited, and that we are about to lose our professional identity in the development of a new, progressive curriculum which has little or no regard for departmental lines. What does all this mean for the teacher of speech and the future of speech education?

In the first place, I think that it is imperative that we separate the issues involved in the activity movement, so far as speech is concerned, from a tremendous amount of loose thinking and talking which seems to persist on this subject. Doubtless it takes extremists and

alarmists to provoke important changes, but there is real danger in this case lest a worthy cause be sadly prejudiced by untactful if not absurd advocacy.

The activity movement has had its greatest development in the elementary schools where departmental lines have never been strong. Unfortunately, speech training on this level has never received the professional attention and development which has come in the secondary schools. Despite a growing interest in recent years, the elementary field continues to present one of the greatest problems and opportunities for the teacher of speech. The growth of the activity movement in the elementary schools and its extension into the more advanced levels most certainly need not jeopardize the future of the teacher of speech or the gains which the profession has made. So long as people are concerned about speech and attempt to develop competence in speech there will be need for the teacher who is professionally trained to provide services of this sort. As a matter of fact, there is much in the activity program and the philosophy upon which it proceeds which gives promise of opportunities for the teacher of speech far in excess of those which might be gained under the old curriculum.

The activity program aims at individual growth in terms of ability in thinking and acting. Such thinking and acting must of necessity be done in co-operation with others. The need for competence in communication is at hand at every turn. The planning of activities involves group deliberation; and "growth" must certainly include the development of language skills. As soon as people begin to think and act in social situations, there is constant occasion for speech. The very thinking which goes into the planning for action must of necessity be intimately associated with language. Thought becomes socially operative only when it is communicated. The speech teacher can and must render invaluable assistance in any activity program at its most central and crucial point—the point where the activity is being planned. Speech is inevitable at this point and the success of the planning cannot help but be importantly conditioned by the nature and character of the deliberations which take place.

The activity program will need to make provision for a certain amount of specialization on the secondary level, with increased opportunities for such specialization on the more advanced levels. There is no reason why speech should not be one of the fields in which specialization is possible. To the extent that this is advisable there will continue to be a need for specialized speech courses with teachers prepared to direct these courses. While the philosophy and method of the activ-

ity program will undoubtedly influence the conduct of this work, there is certainly no reason why it should not persist as speech. The great, new opportunity for the teacher of speech under the activity program will come in the case of those students who are not specializing in speech, many of whom are not now reached by speech work of any sort. Wherever and however these students are brought together in groups for the purpose of planning and executing their activities, there will be speech situations which can be utilized as a basis for speech training. What is more, they are almost certain to be more realistic and purposeful situations than those created in the more or less artificial atmosphere of a speech classroom. Place a competent teacher of speech in contact with groups of students working on projects growing out of their own interests and there is reason to believe that you are approaching the ideal learning situation so far as speech is concerned. Nor do we have to go so far as to try to embody in one teacher the ability to guide all aspects of a group activity. The benefits of an integrated program can be secured with several teachers, each able to bring special help to the group. Most certainly this corps of teachers should include the specialist in speech; and it is likely that his services will be in demand, because he is dealing with the very processes which as much as anything else implement the entire activity.

Experiences in speaking, if they are to be properly educative, should take place in the light of certain knowledge about speech, and should be followed by competent criticisms. In many cases a certain amount of drill is advisable and in some instances, special remedial treatment. All of this requires a trained teacher of speech if it is to be properly done, no matter what may be the organization of the curriculum. The main point here is that the philosophy and method of the activity program is such that we may reasonably expect speech education to achieve added opportunities and increased educational significance under a curriculum organized on this basis. The chief point of what I have had to say here has not been prophecy, nor has it been advocacy; rather it has been to interpret what should be the place of speech in an activity curriculum, and to suggest some of the possibilities for speech work in such a curriculum. Certainly speech teachers have nothing to fear in this direction. There is much in the nature of our work and the history of its development which should commend the progressive education movement to us.

CROSS YOUR T'S AND DOT YOUR I'S

BY JEANE ALLEN PERKINS

I came to Hollywood fresh from school, with a lot of ideas about how good I was. Well, I still believe that, but I had no idea of the many things that I had neglected to do. I put myself to work and I haven't let up for six months and I am still "going it strong."

Of course, being from the South, the first thing I had to do was get rid of my accent. I discovered that I had not a bad accent except for a failure to pronounce all the consonants and a tendency to put in a sound similar to the "ah" we use in breathing exercises instead of the clear, concise "i" that is correct. This, of course, was not my teachers' fault. I had been corrected many times, but I just let myself slip whenever I got out among Southerners who were my friends. I sounded affected to them and they resented it—in fact, when it came to the point of people definitely making fun and ridiculing me behind my back, well—I just gave up and talked the way the majority did. That letting myself go has cost me six months in Hollywood doing almost nothing but trying to lose my accent. Therefore, you "gals" in southern colleges—if you wish to make the movies your career, get out your speech books and perfect your diction. Don't misunderstand me. A pedantic and studied diction is not wanted—but that easy naturalness and unbroken flow of perfect speech. The old "British diction" of the New York stage is definitely unwelcome in Hollywood. If an actor is unquestionably English, all right. It only limits his or her range of parts to be played to a very few. Therefore, the first point to strive for is smooth American speech with no accent or affectation.

The voice is equally important. I owe a very fine speaking voice to the work I did in the Speech Department in Louisiana State. All the silly little "ah's" and "oh's" are of prime importance to the actress or actor. I cannot say enough of the importance of the quality and range of the voice. That development of voice is obtained only by concentrated study of the exercises and their performance daily under the guidance of a University teacher.

As far as interpretation goes, in the movies I believe that the most important thing is utter naturalness and "believability" of the actor. On the stage it is sometimes possible to "put over" a scene if necessary with many stage tricks. This is impossible on the screen. When you are in front of that camera you've got to be the thing you are supposed to be. Nothing else will help. You've got to believe the character and

be it. Any hint of "acting" is magnified by the camera until it looks ridiculous. A scene may be taken twenty-five times before it is printed. Each time you've got to believe and be. You must so be the character that no amount of retakes will separate you from it. There are, of course, many mechanics connected with the screen. You cannot cry for thirty-one takes. But you must so be the person you are playing that if you cry in the first take, you retain that depth of voice and feeling in the next thirty and don't even realize that they have put something in your eyes that makes them water. Under good direction on the amateur stage and in stock companies any one actor learns interpretation for himself. The very best training for the movies is participation in the production of as many plays as possible, playing any part. Of course, many stage actors will never make a success in the movies. That camera can so change their personalities that they are not the same persons, and vice versa. Then my advice to young players is to develop their talent on the amateur stage. Then if they are convinced that they must be actors or actresses, and are sure of their voice and diction, go to the east and work a year or more in stock. Then try Hollywood—not before. I only wish someone had told me that—I believe I was told, but I must not have listened.

One thing is, of course, important—personal appearance. By that I mean mostly physical trim. Good bodies, well proportioned and healthy, are necessary. The actress must have a very slim figure, as the camera adds six to eight pounds to her normal weight. So abstinence is necessary. And that doesn't add much to the joy of living.

The elemental training that is taught in the studio schools for young players is no different from that which I received at Louisiana State University. Therefore, I was prepared that much ahead of the other players. But I did have an accent, and I didn't go east and work in stock for a year. That makes a whole lot of difference in your standing out here. You must come from a good stock company or have a name in radio or some form of entertainment. Otherwise you have a hard battle. But get your elementary and basic principles at your own University. Then think about tackling the outside stage world.

These few bits of knowledge I have picked up watching those who are on top work and by talking to many players on the sets. One last word to the girls. Just because you are beautiful and your friends think you should be in movies—don't get unhappy about it. Many girls who are sure of their charms find out in Hollywood that they are not such raving beauties. It takes that little something in the face

that no one seems to be able to put a name to, to put a personality across the screen. And what a personality it must be—you can just see that something inside the people who are good out here. There's something that radiates from the inside. Sometimes the camera brings out in a normally average person a hidden charm and personality that is not particularly noticeable in real life. You can not tell who is a screen personality.

I think the main thing is to work where you are and do the job of going after the principles of acting at home, and then if you cannot live without giving it a try, why do it. The business is greatly a matter of breaks—the right part coming up that just suits a person at just the right time. It's all a matter of luck. There seem to be no controlling factors. Therefore, it is a very heart-breaking business. But if you stick, and are prepared when the break comes, all is well. This matter of stickability is a little tough. It is usually a matter of years. These meteorites your papers rave about have been hanging around for years studying other actors and working on themselves so that when the time comes they are ready. But what those years mean to them in heartbreak and disappointment is the pathetic story of Hollywood. I have heard true stories of actors who have died of joy when a break came after many years. The stakes are high when they come in, but most of them are bought at a terrific cost of personal deprivation and sorrow. Enough of gloom.

I cannot write down for you Observations 1, 2, and 3 about Hollywood. That just cannot be done. That is why Hollywood holds so much interest and glamor to the outsider. But what I have discovered about training for Hollywood is yours.

Dr. M. F. Evans, of Birmingham-Southern College, is on his Sabbatical this year. He will spend the first term at the University of Iowa and will travel in England the second term. O. C. Weaver is teaching for him.

Plays presented at John B. Stetson University under the direction of Irving C. Stover, were *Little Women* in January, *The Piper* in March, *The Romantic Age* in March, *Macbeth* in June, and a group of one-act plays in July.

Miss Elizabeth Robinson, a former student in the Ruby Cloys Krider Studio of Speech, Paris, Tennessee, made quite a success of her Shakespearean roles with the Globe Theatre at the Great Lakes Exposition in Cleveland this summer. An article in the Cleveland "Plain Dealer," which carried Miss Robinson's picture, quoted Thomas Wood Stevens as calling her his "latest find."

BEAUTY IN BRICKS WITHOUT STRAW

BY JAMES WATT RAINE

I am to answer this question: How do you produce plays of distinction, plays of striking beauty at so little expense?

I shall describe my procedure, give a glimpse of the externals of my method. But we must not forget that however important the author and the director may be, yet the most important part of a play is the player.

I search diligently and thoroughly through the catalogues of ten publishers for a suitable play. I seek for a play that has distinction and yet does not depend on the skill of a great actor; a play that in situations, character portrayal and language will be worth all the labor that we spend upon it. I want a fair proportion of female parts, royalty within our budget, and not too many stage settings.

Regardless of finances, stage settings should be as simple as they can be to produce the desired effect. "Beauty comes through the purgation of superfluities." I remember one school's scene inside a mountain cabin. They had every article the director and cast had ever seen inside log cabins. The scene was cluttered, untidy, confusing to the audience. The pioneer atmosphere would have been secured far more effectively with a stone fireplace, a pot simmering on a trivet, two or three splint bottomed chairs, a wooden churn, a spinning wheel, a bed if there is room for it, a plain kitchen table with square legs, perhaps a bench with tin basin and towel near the door. I have used these properties without any walls at all, merely blue velvet drapes far behind them, and the audience never noticed the absence of the log walls.

I try to work out a stage design that shall not only be a suitable background for the acting but also one in which there is an unobtrusive beauty. A suggestive background helps the players as well as the audience. I make it as early as possible for their benefit so that they may rehearse in the setting as often as possible. For the same reason I make costumes as soon as possible, and as soon as the players know their lines I have costume rehearsals. They must learn to wear them correctly. We cannot have a Rosalind or Viola with the wobbly knees that usually are the result of wearing spike-heel shoes, and George Washington with his diamond-buckle knee-breeches must not walk like a bald-headed paunchy golfer at the Country Club.

The basis of this beauty should be structural. One needs a sense of proportion in arches, doors, windows, columns. It is not wise to splash color over the stage until one sees the structure of the whole

picture. This beauty of composition, of proportion and balanced masses, of pleasing lines and solid safety, is conditioned, very severely conditioned by the fact that unskilled amateurs, not professional artists, have to build the setting. It must therefore be very simple. Many beautiful things that we might manage to design with paper and pencil, we could not make safely and convincingly with wood and iron, canvas and paint in three dimensions. We must not attempt more than we can successfully achieve. But what we do undertake, let it be perfect, judged by the severest standards of a professional artist. Simplicity of design and severity of criticism is the secret of any success that I have attained. For example, may I ask whether the last set of steps that you made represented wooden stairs or stone steps? Have you ever made careful observation of the difference? How are you going to make stone steps out of wood? The last stone-work you painted, did you copy a picture of the actual masonry, or did you just make a lot of absurd curved lines "out of your head"?

It is astonishing how many people make things without having an exact pattern in their minds or before their eyes. Have you ever stood still and looked at a brick or stone wall two hundred feet away? When you look at a house, your eye does not count all the bricks; but the bricks that it does pick out are all rectangular; and stonemasons must "lay up" the stone of a wall in courses, with some regularity. In my files I have pictures of stone walls and brick work, showing mortar, shadows, the wear of time. When I am building an imitation wall, I keep these before my eyes. Therefore my walls never look like pasteboard. This carefulness costs a little more (especially in time) but I am still using walls that I made fifteen years ago.

Our problem is how to achieve beauty with scant expense. Paradoxically instead of making things as cheap as possible, I make them well, for permanent use. Temporary things have a persistent way of looking cheap and wobbly. Beauty, strength, and usefulness in different settings, guide my choice. Begin with two or three sets of steps with platforms to match; an archway, set in a flat if you use flats frequently, an arch standing alone if you use drapes; some pillars or pilasters; and one or two fireplaces (I have four at present, a Victorian marble, an Elizabethan stone, an English or Irish cottage fire, and a rural heavy stone). If these pieces are made well, and of standard size, they will be useful in all sorts of settings and last for years. By standard, I mean my standard, fitting the rest of my scenery. I do not make some steps with six inch risers and some eight inches, but I adopt a standard size and stick to it. Then I can use two sets together,

and the platforms will be the right height. If artistically designed and well made, steps are very effective, both architecturally and to the actor. Most amateur steps look like makeshifts, and are an invitation to break one's neck. All your stage steps should have risers of one height, six inches is good, then three steps will lift the actor only eighteen inches. The "treads" (what the foot rests on) may vary. But they should not be less than ten inches, and twelve is better. A good deal of acting should be done on steps, so they should be wide enough to make the player feel secure. Sets of two or three steps may be as wide as your flats, better an inch less, then a door-flat or an arch-flat can be set up on your top step and the adjoining flats can be lashed close. Higher flights of steps (5-6) I make three feet wide. If your flats are only five feet wide, these steps could be two and a half. Thus two sets could be used side by side, or be used together to make a higher stair. Each set should stand firmly alone, and also should have a foot-iron to screw to the floor, and a strong hook at each side to attach to platform.

Each fireplace is complete in itself, can stand alone, and with metal gliders on the bottom can easily be moved about. Its mantel shelf is at least two inches thick. A small marble fireplace with coal grate should be as wide as a flat, and stand out in the room twelve or fourteen inches. This gives room to build firmly in it the recess showing firebricks at sides and back. A hole at the floor four inches square allows cord and red lamp to be inserted. I never use beaverboard for anything. It is only glorified blotting-paper. The expense of three-ply veneer is more than balanced by its rigidity and permanence. I built an iron basket-grate, easily lifted in and out, of wood painted black. For the larger fireplaces I built a wood fire fixed to andirons. This is hollow so that we can insert a red lamp and a small fan to keep the silk flames moving.

An archway is very effective and gives distinction to a setting, IF the proportions are right. It must also look solid and not like a piece of pasteboard. Too often the "thickness", that gives depth to the arch, is made of pasteboard, or beaverboard, or very thin wood, which cracks and spoils the curve. Building a good arch is no easy job, but if well done it will last for years. I make the frame of a flat, nail in good stiles for the sides of the archway, and a six-inch bar across, *two inches lower* than the top of the arch. Out of this top bar I cut a curved piece two inches deep. Later this curve affords a secure place to which to nail the top of your tin (or roofing iron) arch thickness. Braces from the top bar to the side stiles can be cut into the

correct curve. Eleven wooden brackets (right-angled triangles five inches high will do) can be nailed to the side stiles, the braces and the top bar, seven of them on the curve. Then a six-inch strip of iron roofing can be nailed to these brackets in a perfect curve.

So much for the setting, now for the players. The hardest thing in directing beginners is to get them to DO instead of TALK. They stand around like hitching posts and say a string of sentences instead of BEING interesting persons DOING interesting things. Therefore my first task, after the cast has walked through the play and become familiar with their lines, is to start them doing things instead of merely saying them. To an actor movement is fundamental, speech is incidental. So my first instruction is "Tell it with your legs." Walk, stop, turn, hasten, hesitate, muse, fear, laugh, threaten—telling by your movements what you are doing, thinking, and feeling. At first this seems as forbidding and impenetrable as a blank wall. Most people have been so insistently told "Do sit still Johnnie" and "For goodness' sake, Susie, keep your hands quiet" until they have become as responsive as a sack of potatoes—rather nervous potatoes. When they stand they tiwtch and wriggle; when they move they drift and ooze about the stage in a hesitating fashion. Of course they are hesitating, too often they are trying to recall their lines. Therefore their attention is inward, and not on the scene. If I am dealing with beginners, who have had hitherto none of my instruction, I use a rehearsal at this point to show them how to learn their parts. Learn your part as a series of things that you do. Why do you enter the room? "I want to see Jennie." Why do you want to see Jennie? "To propose to her." Will you come in eagerly or shyly? Are you sure of her answer? If she rebuffs you, will she come towards you, or turn from you? etc., etc.

Let your movements be purposeful and vigorous. When you start to the door, or the desk, or the fireplace, do not drift a step or two, but take enough steps (three or four or five) to get into the minds of the audience where you are going, and why. After the audience has had time to grasp your destination and purpose, some word or action of your fellow-player may stop you suddenly, and the audience will see why you stop. If the player thus learns one movement after another, he will find that the lines come easily. They are merely explanatory footnotes of the movements.

As soon as the players can express their general meanings and feelings by movements, they will gain a new and comfortable confidence. The next step (still telling more and more with your legs) is to tell things in fuller detail by the actions of your arms and hands,

head and face. Gesticulation is often vague, spasmodic, rather hysterical. Every gesture should be significant, and should convey a definite meaning to the audience.

Having established them (sometimes rather shakily) as actors rather than speakers, we next give attention to the *meaning* of what is said, as expressed by the voice through accurate inflections, good phrasing, and spontaneous conversational melodies with wide intervals of pitch. Attention to these matters and to well sustained and well-directed tone must of course be maintained all through rehearsals, even when we are ostensibly giving our chief thought to cues, climaxes, mood, or characterization.

I had the good fortune to be born with a touch of Celtic imagination so that I see visions which I am constantly impelled to transform into realities; and with the thrift of the Lowland Scot so that I neither mar things by haste, nor lose them by waste. Almost as important as the artistic sense is my inheritance of manual skill, by which I can create the things I dream.

To add to my good fortune, I have a wife with a genius for costuming. She can translate my pencil sketches into well-made and well-fitted garments that give distinction to the wearer and beauty to the scene. I suspect the secret of my success lies as much in these happy circumstances as in the methods I have tried to describe.

EXERCISES FOR SPEECH IMPROVEMENT

BY CLIO ALLEN

Out of my bag of tricks, I shall try to bring forth a few that have been most helpful to me in developing in my pupils a speech consciousness and a measure of improvement.

In our speech course we have taken as the bases for good speaking those four requirements listed by Woolbert and Weaver—interesting thought, effective language, effective voice, and effective action. In following this, we use the first few days of the course in getting acquainted. Before I can help that child to improve his speech, and benefit from the establishment of good speech habits, I must know far more than exterior things. I must know what goes on in his mind. And that is not always easily discovered. I have devised a little questionnaire—I hate questionnaires—which I ask him to fill in on the first day he meets the class. It is far from being complete, and some of the things included on it are of doubtful value. But it is the best

thing I have been able to get to help me to get acquainted with the pupil so that I may help him in the selection of something worth while to say.

He is promised that no one except the teacher will see what he has written, and is assured that nothing he says will be held against him in any way, now or later. He is given the privilege of leaving blank anything which he considers unwarranted inquisitiveness on the part of the teacher. But questions are devised to touch every phase of his life—his home life; his family; his ancestry; his pets; his interests in school, in the world of books, in music, in science, in sports, in people; trips he has taken or would like to take; things he has done or would like to do; whether he reads a daily newspaper, and what part of the paper he reads; his plans for the future. The questionnaire does not even mention speech. It is used, nevertheless, in finding things to talk about.

The second requirement of good speaking is effective language; and so the study of words—how to use them and how to pronounce them—takes up a large portion of the time in our fundamental speech course. On at least two days of each week we spend at least a part of the day—often all of it—in drill on giving the correct sounds to vowels and consonants with acceptable precision of articulation and enunciation; inclusion of all commonly included sounds, both individual sounds and syllables; and accenting or stressing the right syllable.

With my classes, lessons in pronunciation usually prove the most fascinating we have. Whenever there is a lull in the lesson for any reason, someone is almost sure to ask for continuation of the drill on words. We have made lists of words which they have mispronounced, with the correct pronunciation indicated in orthographic spelling. We have learned a few phonetic symbols—particularly for those sounds frequently given the wrong quality in our section. Each child makes a "dictionary" of his own speech demons—both vowel and consonant errors. Besides our lists of individual demons, we have long lists for practice. Moreover, we use Webster constantly, because we can depend on it in the matter of accent. Words are put on the board, or more often given on dittoed sheets, in contrasting pairs—in the case of consonants, usually following the contrast of voiced and voiceless; in the case of vowels, using those frequently confused in pronunciation—the "ah" and "aw" sounds; the "short e"—"short i" sounds, and the like. Children sometimes pronounce in unison; more often, one child pronounces and the others follow and criticise. The moment a slip is

made in pronouncing, hands go up all over the room. Practice of this sort serves a double purpose; it makes the speaker more careful, and it trains the ear of the listener to detect errors.

Since experience has proved that pronunciation of isolated words does not fix desirable speech habits, because a pupil who can glibly repeat long lists of words with correct vowel quality, correct articulation, and appropriate accent, often slips back into the habits of years when faced with the words in their context, we have, in addition, continued the drill through hektographed sentences containing the troublesome words and sounds. These sentences come from every available source: from speech texts; from the original sentence in which the error was made; from sentences made by the teacher and loaded with certain types of errors; and from their high school literature texts. In some instances, the children have themselves suggested sentences which have been added to the lists. The present plan is to incorporate all these thousands of sentences into a drill book and make it available to other busy high school teachers, many of whom feel, as I did, the need for such lists, but do not have time to make them. Incidentally there are some drills not needed by certain pupils, because they do not make the specific error which the drill aims to correct. Certain pupils will need more drill than others in correcting errors; and of course, some will never correct them at all, any more than they will correct obnoxious table manners and bad grammatical forms. But I am surprised at the good habits fixed. Student teachers—in English—who have never had any speech work tell me that the children are critical of their pronunciations; and recently, when I picked up a text and began reading a passage including many "en" words which I deliberately pronounced "in", most of the pupils were smiling or frankly laughing aloud before I had finished. To further sensitize pupils to their own errors, I frequently take down from their speeches all sounds of a certain type in which they have violated good usage. For instance, at this time, I have one boy who will not sound his linking "r's". For the last three weeks, these have been the only words on his list. Too many words would discourage, too many types of errors would confuse; and so, I find it advisable to stick to the one or two outstanding errors until the child begins to show some improvement. After that, because he is sensitized to his error, he will gradually correct himself.

Some of our most interesting lessons are in projection. Any lesson in which children must change class rooms is something special. For that reason, the lessons in projection take on the nature of a holiday, for we go to the auditorium. We close the doors and distribute

ourselves over every part of the big room.' One at a time, pupils go to the platform, and, in an ordinary tone, speak a sentence unknown to each other. Each pupil in the audience writes down what he thinks he has heard. Have you ever played the old parlor game of "gossip"? Some of the sentences written down are as funny as those we used to hear. I recall that one boy walked on the stage and said: "The acoustics in this room is perfectly terrible." He must have spoken the truth, for one pupil very near the centre, wrote: "He chews this gum—some kind of spearmint!"

Of course such an experiment is followed by discussion: Why were we unable to hear? Did he speak too fast? Did he enunciate clearly? Was his voice pitched too high? What made this other person easily heard? There are a great many questions, with the pupil assisting in the analysis of his own voice. And the experiment is followed by remedial measures, individual and class, more practice, and experimentation of the same sort at a later time.

The auditorium is also used for pitch, because there is a piano there. We practice as individuals and in unison. We read poetry, sliding up and down the scale with the piano. This is also a "game" in which even the most timid participates freely.

The same plan is used in developing flexible voices; and many pupils find it an interesting game at home—probably much to their families' regret, for I imagine it is really disturbing to have James suddenly show an interest in chanting sentences to the tune of the piano. With reference to flexible voices, **there** is another exercise that has all the qualities of a game, and it may be carried on in the class room. As practice, children are given some sentence as simple as the question: "Are you going to town?" and are asked to read it in at least five different ways. Try the statement: "I thought you were a gentleman." What a difference it makes how one reads it! The sentences are written and slips are passed to the children with suggestions as to how to read them. For instance, one slip may say, "Stress first word"; another "Stress second word"; etc. At times no special word is suggested. Instead, definite adverbs appear on the slips, to suggest how a thing should be said: Scornfully, anxiously, jokingly, regretfully. As children's names are called they respond in the way the slip suggests. It is surprising how difficult this is for some pupils.

In developing pleasing voice quality, the finest exercise seems to be the reading of good literature, with the conscious effort to use chest resonance. Many of our lessons are devoted to reading short passages, using chiefly their own literature texts. Much of this is selections

from blank verse, since they are less likely to sing blank verse. There are passages from *Idylls of the King*, *Sohrab and Rustum*, *Enoch Arden*, the poems of Wordsworth and other poems available to all of them that simply could not be read in any way except in a deep tone.

Another exercise which I have used very successfully in the development of pleasing voice quality is reading in unison or choral reading. It is very gratifying to find the individual improvement that comes through practice in unison. The more timid pupil will participate freely, if he feels that his voice is drowned out in the general sound. Several times each week we try some of this type of reading. It is not a finished product, of course, and I should not care to make a public exhibition of any of my beginning classes; but it is accomplishing results in many ways: It is giving a group of children practice in developing pleasing quality; it is helping them to gain more flexible voices; it is aiding in finding a pleasing pitch; and it is developing appreciation of fine literature, for we use only the best literature in choral reading.

Good speech involves something worth while to say; good language; good voice quality; and ease of bearing. I have hardly touched on the last of these; that is because ease of bearing is such an intangible thing that there is no specific exercise I have found to develop it. We use pantomime to some extent. But in the long run, nothing takes place of practice; and in a single term, there is not a great deal of time for practice; however, if the pupil is given the opportunity of standing before the class at least twice a week and talking informally on some subject in which he is interested; if he is not allowed to fail *once*, but is encouraged to say something if it is only ten words, and is given credit for what he has done; and if the atmosphere in the entire class is informal and helpful at all times, much has been done toward developing ease of bearing.

Practice should not stop at the end of the term, if any lasting good is to be accomplished. And that is the advantage of having the fundamental speech course in the junior year. There is an entire year for practice under the critical eye—and ear—of the supervisor.

REFLECTIONS OF A HIGH SCHOOL DEBATE COACH

BY LOTTYE K. MCCALL

Messick High School, Memphis, Tennessee

That interest in debating in the South is at a low ebb cannot be denied by its most enthusiastic advocate. Early in 1936, the author wrote approximately 125 debate coaches in the Mid-South, including the states of Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Kentucky, endeavoring to secure their participation in a district tournament held at Memphis, last March. Not more than twenty-five replies were received; and only nine debate teams participated, although eleven schools had representatives in the various speech contests. In Tennessee alone there are well over a hundred high schools that are members of the Southern Association of Secondary Schools; yet less than ten per cent of these are members of the National Forensic League. Such a situation is the very apparent result of the lack of knowledge of the work of the League and of the objectives of debate itself.

A study of the purpose of high school debating will reveal at least four objectives: to develop in the student the ability (1) to see both sides of a question, weighing the strength and weakness of each side; (2) to select material with discrimination, rejecting the petty and adhering to the main issues; (3) to organize effectively; and (4) to present his argument pleasingly and convincingly. Each and everyone of these objectives achieved will help the student after his high school days whether he goes to college or enters the business world. No student can go through a season of intensive debating without developing poise and dignity, resourcefulness and initiative.

The author believes the fourth objective, to present his argument pleasingly and convincingly, is the one on which southern debaters need to concentrate. The day has passed when memorized speeches or manuscripts should be inflicted on a long-suffering audience. It is true that it is no easy matter to train high school students to speak extemporaneously; it cannot be done in a year of intensive work; it cannot be done ideally even in four years. But the student receives a mental discipline from the training which he can never hope to gain from the read or memorized speech. To develop this ability to speak extemporaneously requires interested, capable debaters and an enthusiastic coach; for the task is a laborious one. However, the author feels there is no other way to train the student to refute the arguments of the opposition as they arise and to give the debate that pleas-

ing rhythm which carries through the last refutation instead of the jerky effect of the extemporaneous rebuttal following the memorized speech. If debaters are coached to speak extemporaneously, the conversational tone follows naturally, thus sparing the coach the job of giving the monotonous admonition, "Don't preach." In extemporaneous practice care should be taken to stress at all times correct pronunciation and proper enunciation.

In most high schools in our section coaching a debate squad is an extra burden, an addition to a heavy class load; yet the athletic coach has a light class load to enable him to devote more time to the training of his squad. The reason usually given by administrators is that the number of students receiving training in debate does not justify the additional expenditure of time and money. Too often that charge is true. Hours are spent training two, possibly four students, to participate in one debate in the year, perhaps two or three if the team is fortunate enough to win the first contest. How many boys or girls would go out for football or basketball if there were only one game a year or if only two or four people ever participated in a real game? It may be superfluous to add that the way to make the school administrator realize that debate warrants extra expenditure is to create more and varied opportunities for students to debate. Fortunately this can be done, be the school large or small; for the small school is not handicapped as in athletics. Such a procedure means that the coaching will extend over a longer period of the school year, but it will not be as trying because the students will be of more help. Developing a squad is not nearly so difficult if one has the best talent in the school with which to work. But under the present system debating is not attracting the majority of honor students in secondary schools. The debate coach must sell debating to the student body so that a sufficient number will be interested in it to justify extra time for coaching.

How then shall this problem of salesmanship be dealt with? First, the coach must be vitally interested in debating, fully recognizing its value in order to put forth the necessary effort to inspire a group of high school youngsters. Second, the year's work should be planned early in the fall, setting a time for try-outs—possibly some time in December—and drawing up a regular debating schedule with nearby schools to culminate with the district or state contests. A sincere coach ought to avoid concentration on one team; instead he should choose several teams—as many as practical—during the try-outs and use them in the debates with neighboring schools, reserving his final selection until a few weeks before the tournament. Third, intramural

debates with a small loving cup or a similar award to the winning class offers one type of motivation for debate. Fourth, a timely departure from the regular procedure in debate such as the use of the Oregon or the Oxford plan will offer the variety that always attracts. Fifth, a school should be affiliated with the state organization and, if possible, with the National Forensic League. The latter sponsors the National Speech Tournament, held the first week in May, to which it invites winners of first and second place in the state tournaments as well as those in its own district contests. The necessity for southern coaches to be alert to the need for affiliation and participation was no more evident than during the 1936 National Tournament when only two schools from the South, San Jacinto, of Houston, Texas, and Maryville, Tennessee, survived the first four of a total of nine rounds of debate. If a team qualifies for the National Tournament, the members ought to be given an opportunity to go. Attending provides an experience which nothing else will; and if one or more juniors are fortunate enough to be on the team, they will catch a vision which will inspire them to the highest type of debating and enable them to be of inestimable value in developing a team for another year.

OUR 1937 ALL-SOUTH SPEECH TOURNAMENT

BY ORVILLE C. MILLER
Vanderbilt University
Third Vice-President of SATS

For the past several years the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech has sponsored an annual speech tournament in conjunction with its professional convention. Participation in this All-South *concours* speaking event has become more and more the peak of achievement for an ever increasing number of students and teachers in Southern colleges and universities. The 1937 SATS Speech Tournament is to be held in Nashville, Tennessee, on April 20—starting at 8:00 a.m., April 21, and up to noon on April 22, with the Speech Association of Tennessee as host.

That you may be better able to undertake your preparation for this All-South tournament as a fitting climax to your 1936-37 forensic season, the following regulations and request for your cooperative suggestions are set forth below:

I. THE SCHEDULE OF CONTESTS will include *debate, oratory, ex-*

tempore speaking, and *after-dinner speaking*. Each school may have entrants in as many of these events as it desires and an individual student may participate in more than one contest. Moreover, all contests are to be concluded before the meetings of the professional conference begin.

II. ELIGIBLE ENTRANTS will be regularly enrolled undergraduate students carrying at least twelve hours in any senior college of the South which (1) has representation in the Southern Association of Teachers of Speech and (2) provides at least one qualified faculty judge to serve at call throughout the tournament. Each such college may enter *four* qualified students in debate, *one* in oratory, *one* in extempore speaking, and *one* in after-dinner speaking.

III. RANKINGS of schools, teams, and individuals will be determined—those of schools and individuals by the official judges; that of each team by all other teams it has met.

IV. THE JUDGING of each contest will be by one, or (when possible) three or more faculty representatives of those schools entered in the tournament. These judges shall be so distributed that none will judge representatives of his own school nor, in so far as is possible, those of any school more than once.

V. REGULATIONS FOR THE VARIOUS CONTESTS will be as follows:

A. DEBATE

1. *Organization* of the debate contests will be determined by an impersonal mechanical device prepared in its final form before the deadline for receipt of entries. Approximately one-half hour before the first round of debates, each school will draw an arabic numeral and the faculty representative of each school will be assigned the corresponding capital letter. Thereafter, throughout the tournament, the debaters and faculty judge representing a given school will report for their respective debates as indicated on the mechanical chart.

2. *The Question* to be debated may be secured by addressing the Third Vice-President of SATS after November 1, 1936.

3. *Representation*: Each school will enter *as a school* and will be expected to debate *both sides* of the question. Institutions may enter two, three, or four representatives, shifting the personnel at will to form the desired two-member team combination for each new debate.

4. *Speeches*: One ten minute constructive and one five minute rebuttal per each speaker.

5. *Debates*: Each school will debate once in all rounds, except those of the final series and except in case "byes" are required by the mechanics of the series concerned.

6. *Decisions* in all rounds will be announced only after the last round of the series concerned.

7. *Elimination*: Each school will uphold each side of the question as nearly an equal number of times as the mechanics of the series concerned will allow and will meet a new opponent school each round until each school represented in that series has met every other school entered in that series. At the conclusion of these simultaneous "round-robin" series, the school (or schools, if two or more be tied) having won the highest number of debates in each of these preliminary "round-robins" will be advanced to a final series to be set up in the same manner as the original ones. The school (or schools, if two or more be tied) having won the largest number of debates in this final series shall then be declared the winner (s) of the debate tournament.

B. ORATORY

1. *Choice of Subject*: No limitations.

2. *Originality*: Orations must be strictly original with the contestant and previously used in *no* other than local contests. No more than 150 quoted words, clearly stated as such in the oration, are to be used.

3. *Length*: No less than eight, no more than ten minutes.

4. *To Be Judged AS HEARD Upon*: Content, organization, and delivery.

C. EXTEMPORE SPEAKING

1. *The General Subject* is to be different from that used in the debates. Announcement of same may be secured by addressing the Third Vice-President of SATS after November 1, 1936.

2. *The Specific Topic* of each speaker is to be the one chosen by him from two he is to draw, one hour before he speaks, out of the list of topics provided by a neutral person well versed on the general subject.

3. *Originality*: Same as for oratory, except that the limit on quoted words will be 100 and it will be understood that each contestant is to have the privilege of all books, magazines, *et cetera*, accessible but is to, at *no* time following the drawing of his specific topics, consult with or employ the assistance of *any* person other than members of the library staff. He is to speak strictly extemporaneously, without notes.

4. *Questioning*: Each contestant may, upon completion of his speech, be asked by his judge or judges to answer at least two of three questions dealing with his specific topic.

5. *To Be Judged Upon*: Choice of material, organization, and delivery—of *both* the speech and the answers to the questions.

D. AFTER-DINNER SPEAKING

1. *The General Situation*, to be kept in mind as careful preparation is made for the contest, should be considered to be exactly what it will be, *i. e.*, "an annual meeting of students interested in the various phases of extracurricular speech work, and the faculty members engaged in guiding them in their preparation."

2. *The Specific Situation* will be the 1937 Tournament Banquet with the specific personnel, their individual interests, and other such circumstances of that occasion for which, of course, little or no preparation can be made in advance but to which specific adaptation must be made by the effective after-dinner speaker.

3. *Length*: No less than five, no more than seven minutes.

4. *To Be Judged Upon*: Content (may be humorous; must be entertaining), organization (more than a mere string of unrelated stale jokes), delivery, and appropriateness to the general and specific situations. (For examples and further characteristics, see: *After-Dinner Speeches of 1935-36*, Editor, Lyman Spicer Judson).

VI. THE ENTRY FEE of one dollar for each event entered by a team or a speaker must accompany the Entry Blank. If for any reason the entrants are unable to reach the tournament, the fee will be returned. (The Tournament Committee, however, urgently requests that it be so notified as early as possible).

VII. MAKE ENTRIES only on the Official Entry Blank and mail same bearing a post marked date of not later than ten days preceding the opening day of the tournament.

VIII. ALL DETAILS, not adequately cared for herein, are to be determined by the Tournament Committee.

IX. COUNTER SUGGESTIONS, to be considered for application in this year's tournament, should reach the Third Vice-President not later than November 1, 1936.

X. YOUR PART in making the 1937 contests a success is to cooperate as follows:

1. *Enroll your school early* and provide for same in your budget *NOW*.
2. *Urge other schools to participate*.
3. *Offer suggestions*, and
4. *Answer these questions* (by card or letter to the Third Vice-President *NOW*):

- (a) What 3 general subjects, arranged in order of your preference, do you suggest for use in our SATS extempore speaking contest?
- (b) Do you favor, as the subject for debate in our SATS tournament, a proposition different from the Pi Kappa Delta question?
- (c) If you do, what 3 questions—arranged in order of your preference—do you suggest?

Let us red letter on our calendars the big days of April 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24 (thus including also the two and one-half days of the convention), make the 1937 SATS Tournament-Convention the All-South event of the year, and rally under the slogan: "*On to Nashville—'The Athens of the South.'*"

THE FUNDAMENTAL COURSE

A few months ago I read a suggested High School Course of Study with some agitation and alarm. Possibly you read the same article and had similar feelings or perhaps you were thankful for the suggestions that article presented. The author warned that it was a flexible outline and should be adapted by each teacher to fit his particular requirements, however, it was not the arrangement that bothered me—it was the multitude of things suggested for a Fundamental Course of one semester and a semester's work following the Fundamental Course.

The suggested one-year Course of Study was composed of such things as: One week given to the study of voice production including a knowledge of the speech organs and their processes, vocal drills, phonetics, pronunciation and vocabulary building; three weeks given to the study of Interpretation, after which time the entire class should have accomplished: a basic knowledge of the mechanics of Interpretation, mastery of one of each type of interpretative material (eight types were listed), a greater skill in interpretation in general and a repertoire program; one week given to acting technique; three weeks given to play production including directing, staging, make-up, costuming; three weeks given to the study of fourteen different kinds of talks ranging from a radio talk to an eulogy; one week allowed for the mastery of speech composition and so on down the list of possible speech activities.

It makes one wonder just what a Fundamental Course in Speech is and just how much material should be included in a one-year course in High School Speech.

So often the term Fundamental Course has come to mean little more than the first course. It should be the first course and it certainly should lay the ground work for further work in that field. There are those basic things that are needed for every phase of speech work, such as clear thinking, an adequate voice—which includes good quality, distinct articulation, clear enunciation, flexibility and adequate projection—and a controlled body. Is it necessary to attempt to touch all phases of speech work in a desire to learn these BASIC qualities?

I do not believe it necessary nor advisable to include so many phases of speech work in a one year high school course. It might be justifiable if the course is being offered in order to acquaint the student with the different lines of speech work so that he will have more of an idea concerning his speech major in College. But I do not believe that should be the purpose of a one-year high school speech course. I believe its purpose should be to acquaint the student with himself to such an extent that he will be able to adjust himself to secure the greatest returns from his everyday activities.

It would be impossible for the student to master such a variety of work in one year and he is apt to get the wrong idea concerning speech work. He would become lost in a maze of new techniques and not only would he be unable to master any one of them but he would be unable to make those basic FUNDAMENTAL qualities of speech a part of his everyday routine. Such a smattering is unfair to the student. Such a smattering is unfair to Speech as an academic subject!

I wonder if all of us are not too prone to make our classes resemble a patch-work quilt. It appears easier to jump from one thing to another and to attempt to answer every student's whim concerning speech. We all want to meet the desire of our students but often we lose perspective in that attempt. Often we are too close to our own material; too sure of what "we have done before" to give an unbiased, weighed judgment concerning our own teaching; often we think we are too busy to make detailed plans that will lead us to definite, well-chosen aims and so we content ourselves with a speech program that does not give the student a square deal. Too often the first course is a survey course and not a FUNDAMENTAL course.

Many of us are like the hunter, who not satisfied with aiming at one or two ducks, wanted the whole string so he moved his gun as he

pulled the trigger in order to "swipe 'em all at one shot." So we—aim not at those basic things but, as we teach, attempt to hit the entire string of speech activities with one class. Barring luck and miracles that kind of a course is doomed to failure.

Harley Smith.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION

The National Association of Teachers of Speech should mother all the Divisional Speech Associations in our country, so as a representative of the National Association, I earnestly wish every member of the Southern Association could be with us in St. Louis on December 29, 30, 31 of this year. We need you and you need the larger contact and widening influence of our association.

We will be there to celebrate, in this election year, our twenty-first anniversary, our majority. Of course, we were the result of two previous associations—the National Association of Elocution, founded in 1892 in New York City and its successor, The National Association of Speech Arts.

Never before in our natural life is the need of good speech so important. The radio, the screen, politics demand training in communication from the first grade through college. Never before is the need of *live* literature so imperative. The theoretic teaching of literature has not carried over in life, and what is education for, if not for a better and richer life. Literature is a dead subject, and the only hope for better citizens is a *reading* public who will read the best. Uplifting printed pages should be made alive; literature is not literature until it is felt, thought, spoken. We have a great mission. We are most important in the educational field. We must take every opportunity to improve ourselves, that we may make the presiding educational men and women recognize the importance of our discipline.

Come to St. Louis—and be sure to speak to me, and tell me where you are located, and in what field you are teaching.

Yours for better speech,

Maud May Babcock.

The University of Alabama now offers a major in Speech for the A.B. degree.

EDITORIALS

THE SECOND YEAR

This issue marks the beginning of the second year of *The Southern Speech Bulletin*. Just a year ago, "quaking in our boots", we began. We wondered how you would like us. We wondered if there would be money enough to pay for us. We wondered if we would have enough material. We wondered if there would be a place for us.

You liked us well enough to vote for our continuance at the Gainesville Convention. Last year's issues are paid for. We have enough material for a quarterly. We believe there is a place for us.

We still wonder if we can be paid for this year. We still wonder if the Southern Teachers of Speech will support us. We still wonder when we will have enough circulation to get advertisements to help pay expenses. We still wonder how long it will be before we can become a quarterly.

We are eager to fill a real need with Southern Speech Teachers. We are eager to have your articles and suggestions. We are eager to have your criticism and encouragement. Will you give them to us? Will you help us get sufficient money by getting your friends to join the Association?

May we again say our purpose is to have short practical articles that will help you solve your speech problems? When you have solved problems, won't you write a short article about them and send it to us, unsolicited, so that others may profit by your solution? When you need help, ask us for help, and we may be able to find others to help solve your problems.

If you will do this, you will have real help from *The Southern Speech Bulletin*. It will help standardize the teaching of speech. It will help unify the Teachers of Speech.

UNITY IN DIVERSITY

By

GILES WILKESON GRAY

Developments in the field of Speech during the past two decades have exhibited a strong tendency toward specialization and diversification. The "general specialists" of whom Professor Hunt wrote so feelingly in the early days of the National Association have almost disappeared; among the younger generation they are practically unknown. One concentrates nowadays on specific aspects of the larger discipline, only incidentally if at all touching on other phases.

While such divergence in interests has its undoubted values, it

also has some disadvantages. Chief among these is probably the loss of perspective suffered by these very specialists. We hardly expect the speech pathologist to interest himself intimately, or even remotely, in drama, or in debating, or in choral reading. Nor is the director of debating or of drama expected to be a pathologist. He cannot do both well.

But while this specialization and diversification is inevitable, we should not lose sight of an essential unity in the field of speech as a whole. The specialist in Fundamentals will be a better "Fundamentalist" if he knows something of the other aspects of the general subject. The debate coach will be a better coach if he knows the fundamentals of the speech processes. The director of drama will produce better plays and will achieve the goals of educational drama more certainly if he has a clear conception of the place of his particular phase in the general discipline.

Our conventions, unfortunately, have emphasized diversity rather than unity. We have provided sectional meetings and discussions on various aspects of speech—public speaking, drama, debating, interpretation, pathology, phonetics, etc.—without considering seriously the possible interrelations between these subjects. And yet, if we are to justify the continuation of Speech as an academic discipline, we must not only recognize, but emphasize the essential unity which permeates the whole field.

It has been my thought that for the Convention program for the current year, it would be of considerable value to throw the emphasis in the opposite direction from that in which it has been thrown during the past years. This is not in criticism of former programs; it is only a recognition that we need occasionally at least to take stock of ourselves, our teaching and our subjects, and attempt to see just where they fit in to the general scheme. This need not be done every year. But since we have not done it so far, in the life of the Southern Association, it seems to me fitting that we take this year to consider this aspect of our work.

To this end I am asking every reader of this Bulletin, and especially the chairmen of the various sections who are to be appointed for the Convention program, to consider their sectional programs in the light of the inherent unity in the field. What are the objectives of departments or of divisions of speech? What contribution do the various subjects make to the accomplishment of these objectives? I cannot but feel that a consideration of these questions, and others as they may arise, will be of tremendous value to all of us.

BOOK REVIEWS

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF SPEECH. By Lew Sarett and William Trufant Foster. Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1936. pp. 577.

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF SPEECH is arranged in two parts. Part I, composed of twelve chapters, deals with *Delivery*; and Part II in nine chapters discusses *Composition*. In my judgment, there is presented in these pages the most scholarly, comprehensive, and practical treatment of the basic principles of speech delivery and composition that I have ever seen between the covers of one book. For both the student and the teacher of Speech, this book is a distinctive contribution and marks a real advance in the scholarship of our field.

Part I on *Delivery* contains chapter discussions of *Speech in Everyday Life*, *Six Basic Principles*, *Developing Confidence and Poise*, *Directness and the Conversational Spirit*, *Bodily Action*, *A Method of Self-Motivated Action*, *The Voice*, *Melody*, *Time*, *Force*, and *Suggestion*. These twelve chapters contain as fine an analysis and as clear a presentation of the problems of *Delivery* as I have seen. Introducing the fictitious mute John Doe and the self-conscious Richard Roe in chapter one, the book reads as interestingly as a novel and the reader is made to feel the importance of speech in everyday life. The authors then set forth what they believe to be the basic principles of speech. And around these basic principles of speech, the book is built. They are six in number. First, "effective speech is not for exhibition but for communication." Second, "effective speech commands attention in order to win response." Third, "the technique of effective speech is unobtrusive and therefore disarming." Fourth, "speech is effective, other things being equal, in proportion to the intrinsic worth of the speaker." Fifth, "impressions of the speaker are derived largely from signs of which the audience are unaware." Sixth, "effective speech results in part from free bodily action." The next ten chapters develop most admirably by suggestion and by illustration "how" the student may acquire proficiency in speech through a mastery of these six basic principles. Literally scores of fresh speech topics and exercises for both extemporaneous speaking and memory work are included in this book. I can say conscientiously that I experienced a real thrill as I saw and felt these principles of speech interpreted, illustrated, applied and what's more MADE TO LIVE throughout these pages.

Part II on *Composition* contains chapter discussions of *First Steps in Composition*, *Finding, Choosing and Arranging Materials*, *Outlines*, *The Introduction*, *The Body: Argumentation*, *the Body: Persuasion*,

The Conclusion, The Language of Speech, and Radio Speaking. In introducing Part II on *Composition* the authors present immediately the *First Steps in Composition*. They suggest four. First, in the development of speech power the speaker must make himself worth listening to. Second, the speaker must select subjects which are related to his experiences, interests, or convictions. Third, after selecting his subject, the speaker must formulate clearly in one sentence the specific response that he seeks. Fourth, the speech must have a good title—a title that suggests but does not explicitly state the main idea—it must not say too much. In these nine chapters on *Composition*, the authors present and interpret the various steps involved in constructing a speech. Especially pleased was I with the attention given by them to the preparation of the speech. They use the term “preparation” broadly. It means several things: the intrinsic worth of the speaker himself; the necessity for him to have ideas, experiences, convictions, interests; the need for a clear outline of those ideas, experiences, etc.; and attention to the choice of words and sentences. All these factors play major roles in the composition of the speech. The authors deal with *Composition* as they do with *Delivery* by interpreting, illustrating, and making practical their many suggestions.

Frankly, I like the book. It is readable but more than that it is usable. It is scholarly in its method; it is comprehensive in its analysis of the field of speech; it is practical in its demonstration of the vital principles of speech education. But to me, greater than any single one of those factors and fundamentals to all of them, is its emphasis on the character of the speaker himself. In my own teaching, it is true that I am anxious to train students to be better conversationalists, to be better speakers before a jury, to be more effective ministers in the pulpit, in brief, for all students to develop a greater measure of self-confidence. But fundamental to all of those achievements, I want my students to have character, intrinsic worth, to be real men. This book emphasizes, alongside a very practical technique and method in speech education, the intrinsic worth of the speaker himself. This book impresses me more than any similar book I have examined in a long, long time.

Leroy Lewis, Duke University.

* * * * *

MODERN DEBATING. By Egbert Ray Nichols and Joseph H. Baccus. W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1936. pp. 432.

MODERN DEBATING is arranged in four parts. Part I, composed of four chapters, presents *The Philosophy of Debate*. Part II

in six chapters discusses *The Technique of Debate*. *The Thinking Processes of Debate* are analyzed in five chapters in Part III. And Part IV is concerned with *The Incidentals of Debate Practice*. Appendices include: (1) *Historical Sketch of Intercollegiate Debating*; (2) *Scheme for Topic List for Debate Cards*; (3) *List of Societies and Organizations Publishing Material Useful to Debaters*; and (4) *Bibliography of Debating*.

The authors approach debate from an "educational standpoint" and they consider debate primarily an "academic exercise." Their aim is a "re-examination of debate aims, purposes, nature, and values." In this consideration they give primary attention to the "individual student." The authors feel, as I understand their approach, that perhaps debate has swung too far toward persuasion in speech and the audience reaction. While the authors do not overlook the audience, neither do they give it undue emphasis. They "would not neglect the speech occasion and the audience," but they do feel that "beyond that it is not necessary to go in audience consciousness." This view of debate is, in my judgment, a very wholesome one and will be much approved by those of us who feel that debate has been too "exhibitory" and too "bull-doggish" in recent years. To emphasize the educational values of debate FOR the student is the approach of this book. The student is the center of attention in MODERN DEBATING.

Since the approach is in part a new one, the arrangement of chapters is a little different from the usual order. Part I on *The Philosophy of Debate* contains chapter discussions on *The Nature of Debate—Special Characteristics*, *The Relationships of Debate*, and *The Value of Debate*. Part II on *The Technique of Debate* contains chapters on *The Forms and Kinds of Debate*, *The Debate Proposition*, *Debate Evidence*, *Mechanical Aids for the Debater*, *The Development of the Debate Case*, and *The Debaters on the Platform*. Part II dealing with *The Thinking Processes of Debate* includes discussions of *Debate Reasoning—Science and Logic*, *The Psychology of Debate Reasoning*, *Fallacies in Debate Reasoning*, *The Strategy of Debate*, and *Rebuttal and Refutation*. Part IV on *The Incidentals of Debate Practice* presents chapters on *The Function of the Audience in Debate*, *The Debater as a Public Speaker*, *The Coach and Modern Debate Practice*, *Decision versus Non-Decision Debating*, *The Methods of Judging Debates*, and *The Basis of Judging Debates*.

In MODERN DEBATING you will notice certain new chapters such as *The Psychology of Debate Reasoning*, *The Debaters on the Platform*, *Decision versus Non-Decision Debating* and *The Basis of*

Judging. It also gives a new treatment of *The Strategy of Debate*, *The Coach and Modern Practice*, and of *Debate Reasoning*. While such familiar chapter headings as *The Brief* are not included, this book is both comprehensive and scholarly in its treatment of the theory and practice of debate. It covers the subject of debate completely—from the choosing of the proposition to the rendering of the decision. It will carry both the student and the teacher speedily through the arduous duties of debate with a technique that is scientific and with suggestions that are practical.

The teacher of Speech is likely to have a greater appreciation of Part I on the *Philosophy of Debate* than is the student. But when this short discussion is completed at the end of forty-eight pages, the remainder of the book will unfold more easily to the student. The reader is introduced one step at a time to the intricacies of debate in a very careful manner—and always with the educational interests of the student foremost. To the student and teacher seeking a broad view and a comprehensive understanding of the theory and practice of debate from an "educational viewpoint" I suggest that this is the book that will serve your purpose. MODERN DEBATING places debate alongside mathematics, science and literature as a definite part of the college curricula.

Leroy Lewis, Duke University.

NEWS AND NOTES

INTRODUCING THE NEW EDITORS

ROSE B. JOHNSON—Born in North Carolina. A.B., Brenau College; M.A. (English), University of Georgia; M.A. (Speech), University of Michigan. Taught Blackstone College, High Schools in Georgia, Bramwell, W. Va., and now at Birmingham, Ala. Author: *Manual for High School Speech*, and magazine articles. Member: Zeta Phi Eta and Alpha Psi Omega.

* * * * *

ORVILLE C. MILLER—Graduate Curry School of Expression; A.B., Indiana University; M.A., University of Michigan; work towards Ph.D., Columbia University. Taught Private Studio, Elon College, University of Michigan, University of Arkansas, and now at Vanderbilt University. Author: Contributing editor of *After-Dinner Speeches of 1935-36*, *Monographs and Periodicals*. Member: Pi Kappa Delta, Delta Sigma Rho, Tau Kappa Alpha (District Governor), Theta Alpha Phi, and Alpha Psi Omega.

* * * * *

HARLEY SMITH—Born in Oklahoma. A.B. and O.B., Phillips University; M.A., University of Wisconsin; Ph.D., L. S. U. Worked with Chautauquas, Stock Companies, Robert Mantell, Moving Pictures, and Radio. Taught:

Phillips University, Covington High School, Yukon High School, and now at L. S. U. Member: National Collegiate Players, and others.

* * * * *

LEROY LEWIS: Born in Oklahoma. A.B., Oklahoma City University; M.A., University of Michigan. Taught at the University of Wichita and now at Duke University. Author of magazine articles. Member: Tau Kappa Alpha, Pi Kappa Delta, etc.

* * * * *

LOUISE SAWYER—Born in Illinois. Graduate of Columbia College of Expression; B.S., Northwestern University. Played and directed with Carolina Playmakers, three seasons with the Coffee-Miller Players. Now at Georgia State Woman's College. Member Zeta Phi Eta.

* * * * *

A. A. HOPKINS—Born Pennsylvania. Ph.B., Brown University; M.A., University of Iowa. Taught in Public Schools and Colleges in Oklahoma, Illinois, and now at the University of Florida. Served with the Infantry in A. E. F. Author: Magazine articles. Member: Tau Kappa Alpha, etc.

* * * * *

AND THE NEW PRESIDENT

GILES W. GRAY—Born in Indiana. A.B., DePauw University; M.A., University of Wisconsin; Ph.D., University of Iowa. Taught in Schools of Indiana, University of Illinois, University of Iowa. Served in World War. Now at L. S. U. Author: *The Bases of Speech* (with C. M. Wise) *Workbook in Public Speaking* (with C. E. Kantner), Editorial Staff of *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, numerous articles in magazines. Member: Tau Kappa Alpha, Kappa Delta Pi, and Sigma Xi.

* * * * *

Miss Louise Feagin is a new assistant in Speech and English at Woodlawn High School, Birmingham, Alabama. Miss Feagin graduated three years ago from Birmingham-Southern and then taught two years in the Jackson School in Birmingham. Last year she attended her aunt's school, The Feagin School of Dramatic Art in New York.

* * * * *

The Mississippi Association of Teachers of Speech held its annual convention Friday, April 24, 1936. The program was as follows:
Trends in the Modern Theatre, with Application to College

Dramatics.....Miss Mildred Singer, Mississippi State College for Women
Types of Plays Suitable for the Secondary School.....Miss Amelia B. Ruxton
Whitworth College

Dramatics in the High School Program.....Miss Evelyn Steadman
Demonstration School, State Teachers College

* * * * *

Miss Carolyn Vance, University of Georgia and Miss Mamie Jones, Huntington College, Montgomery, Alabama, did graduate work this summer at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.

* * * * *

The Tennessee Association of Teachers of Speech held its annual convention in Nashville, April 10-11, 1936. The programs were as follows:

Friday, April 10

Greetings from:

- (a) President, National Association Teachers of Speech.
- (b) President, Southern Association Teachers of Speech.
- (c) Response and Address: "Speech Goals in America and England."
Mary Evans Saunders, President, Tennessee Association Teachers
of Speech.

"Speech Credits and Speech Courses for High Schools".....R. R. Vance
State High School Supervisor, Nashville

"The Importance of Speech Courses in High School".....H. F. Srygley
Superintendent, Nashville City Schools

"Speech Courses at Columbia University".....Miss Catherine Winnia
Ward-Beimont College, Nashville

"The Corrective Speech Clinic".....Mrs. Newman Brandon
Nashville

"Required Speech Credits in Tennessee and Other States".....Prof. Orville Miller
Vanderbilt University, Nashville

"Art Principles in the Stage Picture—A Demonstration".....L. Pearl Saunders
School of Art and Applied Design, Nashville

A Panel Discussion Subject: "What Should Go Into the Basic Course in
Public Speaking"

Leaders:

- (a) Dr. J. B. Emperor, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- (b) H. H. Gladney, Benton High School, Benton.
- (c) Miss Helen Brixey, Park Junior High School, Knoxville.
- (d) Miss Lillian Kelley, Copper Hill High School, Copper Hill.
- (e) Miss Vie Smith, Norris High School, Norris.
- (f) Oscar Sams, Knoxville High School, Knoxville.

"Demonstration in Play Production—A Period Costume Play"

Students of Hume-Fogg High School, Directed by Inez Bassett Alder.

"Directing College Play Production".....Pauline Sherwood Townsend
Ward-Beimont College, Nashville

"Choral Verse Speaking".....Students of East Nashville High School
Directed by Julia Gibson

"Effective Methods in Teaching Argumentation".....Prof. Gordon F. Siefkin
Southwestern University, Memphis

"Demonstration in Play Production—A Romantic Light Comedy"

Students of the Tennessee School for the Blind. Directed by Sara Gray

Radio Broadcast—Station WSM. Director: Rufus Phillips, Dramatic Director,
Nashville.

Saturday, April 11

"Mountain Playmaking".....Prof. Earl Hobson Smith
Lincoln, University

"Demonstration in Creative Dramatics".....Miss Susan Vaughn, Director

"Modern Poetry for Oral Interpretation"

Students of Miss Jennie Mai McQuiddy, Nashville and Mrs. May Rousseau,
Lebanon

"Storytelling for Special Occasions".....Nancy Rice Anderson
Nashville

"Organizing the Community Playhouse".....Reber Boulton
Community Players, Nashville

"The Cultural Value of Speech Curriculum in Schools and Colleges"
Wm. H. McKellar, University of the South, Sewanee

* * * * *

Miss Louise A. Sawyer, Georgia State Woman's College, Valdosta, Georgia, taught Speech at the University of Georgia summer school.

* * * * *

The Georgia Association of Teachers of Speech held its annual convention in connection with the seventy-first annual convention of the Georgia Education Association in Macon, Georgia, April 16-18, 1936. The meetings were held in the Macon Little Theatre. The programs were as follows:

Friday, April 17

Business Meeting. Miss Louise Sawyer presiding.

"Speech Work in Georgia".....Supt. A. G. Cleveland

Valdosta

Demonstration of the Value of Speech Recording.....Miss Frances Gooch

Agnes Scott College

"Making a Beginning in 'Stage Construction'".....Dr. Wilbur Stout

Mercer University

"Scenery: Drapes and Set Pieces".....Gwynne Burrows

Southwestern Scenic Supply Co., Atlanta

Demonstration in Make-up.....Kent James

Commercial High School, Atlanta

"The 'Scholastic Repertory Theatre'".....Douglas Hume

Wesleyan Conservatory

Open House at the Macon Little Theatre honoring the Georgia Association of Teachers of Speech, Mrs. Piercy Chestney, president Little Theatre, in charge.

Annual Banquet, Red Room, Hotel Dempsey, Miss Edna West in charge.

Play—Presented by the Macon Little Theatre.

Saturday, April 18

Demonstration of Speech Handicaps.....Mrs. W. W. Davison

Atlanta

"Speech in Modern Curriculum".....Dr. M. S. Pittman

President, South Georgia Teachers College, Statesboro

"Do's and Don'ts for the One-Act Play Contest".....State Representative

Business Meeting, Election of Officers. Appointment of Committees.

* * * * *

Among the Southern Speech Teachers doing graduate work at the University of Michigan during the Summer were Leroy Lewis of Duke University, Alethia Hunt of William and Mary College and Rose Johnson of Woodlawn High School, Birmingham, Ala.

* * * * *

Alabama College gave *Squaring the Circle* for their senior play in May. It was directed by Ellen-Haven Gould.

* * * * *

Plays at L. S. U.—Jan. 14, 15, 16: "A Doll's House," directed by Lynn Orr. May 6, 7, 8: A Shakespearian play. July 24—"Arms and the Man," directed by G. W. Gray

Graduates of L. S. U. that are now teaching are—Elizabeth Cuthrell, Monroe, La., Ouachita Parish High School; Cassa Lou McDonald, Bolton High, Alexandria, La.; R. L. Flowers, McMurry College, Texas; E. C. Blackshear, Southpark High School, Beaumont, Texas; Harry Wise, Baker University, Baldwin, Kans.

Harriett Idol, Ph.D. in Speech, was the first woman granted a Ph.D. by L. S. U.

Claude Shaver is attending the University of Wisconsin, working toward a Ph.D.

Foy van Dolson, L. S. U. student, is with the Pasadena Community Theatre. He appeared in "Coriolanius" this summer.

Johnny Akin Fenn, M.A. from L. S. U., and working toward a Ph.D. at L. S. U., received a M.S. degree from University of Michigan this summer.

Harley Smith was with the continuity department of N. B. C., New York, this summer.

Harriett Idol will give a new course in *Voice Improvement* at L. S. U. this fall. It will be open to sophomores and juniors.

* * * * *

Dr. John B. Emperor, University of Tennessee, spent the summer vacation months in New York state.

* * * * *

The Ruby Cloys Krider Studio of Speech, Paris, Tennessee, offered a five weeks' course for teachers of Speech during the past summer. Courses in the unified curriculum were: Vocal Interpretation, Bodily Action, Pantomimic Interpretation, Stage Direction, Acting, Make-Up, Voice and Speech, and Children's Dramatics. Classes were in session from 9 to 12 a.m., five days per each of the five weeks. Mrs. Krider reports an enrollment of 17 in the advanced classes and 15 in the children's class. A certificate was granted upon satisfactory completion of the course.

* * * * *

T. Earle Johnson, head of the Department of Speech at the University of Alabama is on leave this year to study for the Ph.D. in Speech at the University of Wisconsin. During his absence, Dr. Lester Raines is acting head of the department and director of dramatics.

* * * * *

Melvin Israel of the University of Alabama Speech staff is news commentator and football announcer for Radio Station WBRC, Birmingham, a C. B. S. affiliate.

* * * * *

The Blackfriar Players of the University of Alabama now in their thirtieth season are announcing a program of six plays, two major and four minor, for the school year. The opening production will be given in October.

* * * * *

Helen Osband of the University of Alabama is offering a new course called "Speech for Teachers" as an elective for students in the College of Education.

* * * * *

EIGHTH ANNUAL CONVENTION

Nashville, Tennessee, April 20 - 24, 1937

